



IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF SOUTH CAROLINA
FLORENCE DIVISION

LARRY JAMES TYLER,
Plaintiff,

vs.

WAYNE BYRD; PAUL M. BURCH;
JAMES BOGLE; and J. RICHARD JONES,
Defendants.

§
§
§
§
§
§
§
§

§ CIVIL ACTION NO. 4:16-00400-MGL-BM

ORDER ADOPTING THE REPORT AND RECOMMENDATION
AND DISMISSING DEFENDANTS PAUL M. BURCH, JAMES BOGLE, AND
J. RICHARD JONES, AS WELL AS ANY CLAIMS THAT RELATE TO PLAINTIFF'S
UNDERLYING CONVICTIONS OR PENDING PCR OR SVP PROCEEDINGS,
WITHOUT PREJUDICE AND WITHOUT ISSUANCE AND SERVICE OF PROCESS

This case was filed as a 42 U.S.C. § 1983 action. Plaintiff is proceeding pro se. The matter is before the Court for review of the Report and Recommendation (Report) of the United States Magistrate Judge suggesting that the Court dismiss Defendants Paul M. Burch, James Bogle, and J. Richard Jones, as well as any claims that relate to Plaintiff's underlying criminal convictions or pending PCR or SVP proceedings, without prejudice and without issuance and service of process. The Report was made in accordance with 28 U.S.C. § 636 and Local Civil Rule 73.02 for the District of South Carolina.

The Magistrate Judge makes only a recommendation to this Court. The recommendation has no presumptive weight. The responsibility to make a final determination remains with the Court. *Mathews v. Weber*, 423 U.S. 261, 270 (1976). The Court is charged with making a de novo

determination of those portions of the Report to which specific objection is made, and the Court may accept, reject, or modify, in whole or in part, the recommendation of the Magistrate Judge or recommit the matter with instructions. 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1).

The Magistrate Judge filed the Report on July 27, 2016, but Plaintiff failed to file any objections to the Report. “[I]n the absence of a timely filed objection, a district court need not conduct a de novo review, but instead must ‘only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record in order to accept the recommendation.’” *Diamond v. Colonial Life & Acc. Ins. Co.*, 416 F.3d 310, 315 (4th Cir. 2005) (quoting Fed. R. Civ. P. 72 advisory committee’s note). Moreover, a failure to object waives appellate review. *Wright v. Collins*, 766 F.2d 841, 845-46 (4th Cir. 1985).

After a thorough review of the Report and the record in this case pursuant to the standard set forth above, the Court adopts the Report and incorporates it herein. Therefore, it is the judgment of the Court that Defendants Paul M. Burch, James Bogle, and J. Richard Jones, as well as any claims that relate to Plaintiff’s underlying criminal convictions or pending PCR or SVP proceedings, are hereby **DISMISSED WITHOUT PREJUDICE** and without issuance and service of process. The Complaint will be served on Defendant Wayne Byrd with respect to Plaintiff’s claims relating to tampering with mail, refusal to make copies of documents, and stopping his mail.

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Signed this 16th day of August, 2016, in Columbia, South Carolina.

s/ Mary Geiger Lewis
MARY GEIGER LEWIS
UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE

NOTICE OF RIGHT TO APPEAL

The parties are hereby notified of the right to appeal this Order within thirty days from the date hereof, pursuant to Rules 3 and 4 of the Federal Rules of Appellate Procedure.